

REMARKS

Claims 1-51 were pending at the time of examination. No claims have been cancelled. Claims 1, 19, 34, 37, 40, 42-43, 46-47 and 49-51 have been amended. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 34-51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the expression “the at last one computer readable product” lacks antecedent basis in claims 34, 42-43, 46-47 and 49-51. The Applicants have amended the claims, as well as other claims having the same issues, to correct the antecedent basis problem and submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is now moot and should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-8, 10-13, 19-28, 34-41 and 43-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by “Evite Tour,” Evite, March 2001 (hereinafter Evite). The Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

Initially, the Applicants would like to point out that this reference cannot be cited under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), since the reference is not a patent or an application for a patent. Furthermore, the present application is a continuation in part application filed on December 2, 2003, and claiming priority of U.S. Patent Application No. 09/820,966, which was filed on March 30, 2001. The Evite reference, according to the Examiner, is dated “March 2001,” so the Applicants will assume that the Examiner intended more appropriately to cite Evite under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) or possibly 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), at least with respect to any subject matter that may not be supported by the priority application.

The Applicants have amended claim 1 to more clearly define the invention and make more apparent the distinctions between the Applicants' invention and the subject matter described in the Evite reference. In particular, claim 1, as amended, now recites a method for provisioning services within a message interchange network. The message interchange network has been discussed extensively in U.S. Patent Application No. 09/820,966, which is incorporated by reference in the present application. However, for the sake of clarity and ease of understanding the present invention, some features of the message interchange network have also been added to claim 1. For example, claim 1 recites that the message interchange network has “a plurality of services associated therewith, each of which are accessible by others of the plurality

of services, each service representing one or more computer applications on one or more computing devices accessible to other computing devices through the message interchange network," that the message interchange network is "a hosted network overlaying a public network" and that the message interchange network can "mediate messages sent between the services so that each service receives messages in a format specified by the respective service, without the senders of the messages being aware of the specified format." It is respectfully submitted that these features of the message interchange network distinguishes the message interchange network from a public network, such as the Internet, and that Evite does not provision any services within such a message interchange network.

Furthermore, the services of the present invention have been further described in claim 1 as "representing one or more computer applications on one or more computing devices accessible to other computing devices through the message interchange network." This further description ought to eliminate any confusion with respect to the cited "dinner appointment" in Evite. The remaining steps of claim 1 have been modified to include the use of a "service manager," which has been extensively described in, for example, paragraphs [0027], and [0030] - [0031] of the specification, as well as the message interchange network. The service manager does not only track information with respect to the offers and the invitees, but also sets up permissions between an invitee and the service if the invitee accepts the offer, as recited in claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that Evite neither teaches nor suggests any services representing computer applications and that require permissions to be set up between the service and an invitee. It is also respectfully submitted that Evite neither teaches nor suggests a service manager having the functionalities described in claim 1. For at least these reasons the rejection of claim 1 is unsupported by the art and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-18 all depend from claim 1, and are therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, and the rejections of claims 2-18 should be withdrawn.

Claim 19 is a system claim with limitations similar to the limitations of claim 1, and is therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, and the rejection of claims 19 should be withdrawn.

Claims 20-33 all depend from claim 19, and are therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 19, and the rejections of claims 20-33 should be withdrawn.

Claim 34 is a *Beauregard* claim corresponding to claim 1, and is therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, and the rejection of claims 34 should be withdrawn.

Claims 35-51 all depend from claim 34, and are therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 34, and the rejections of claims 35-51 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

The Applicants hereby petition for a one-month extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. GCENP003).

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Fredrik Mollborn
Reg. No. 48,587

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300